

Appl. No. 10/700,614  
Atty. Docket No. 9422L  
Amdt. dated June 27, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of 06/07/2005  
Customer No. 27752

### REMARKS

Claim 1 is amended to require at least one burnish to be flat and generally planar. Claim 2 is amended to require both burnishes to be flat and generally planar. Basis for the flat and planar limitation is found in Figs. 1A and 1B. Claim 12 is canceled accordingly.

Claim 11 is amended to recite at least one burnish is convex. Basis is found in Figs. 4B, 4C and 7B. Claim 13 is amended to recite the hinge and articulation limitations of Claim 15. Claim 15 is canceled accordingly.

Claims 1-7, 9, 11, and 12-14 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as anticipated by Buske (US 3,907,628). The Office Action (p. 3) states that the burnishes disclosed by Buske are flat, citing Figs. 1-4.

The most descriptive of these figures is Fig. 4, described by Buske as a cross-sectional view (2:49). Applicant has provided an enlarged view of Fig. 4 for the Examiner's convenience.

Two of the surfaces in Fig. 4 (adjacent reference numbers 16 and 18) are concave. The two presser edges 20, 22 of Fig. 4 are convex as noted by the instant Office Action (p. 2, para. 3).

The enlarged Fig. 4 reveals no flat surface usable as a burnish. Examination of all of Figs. 1-4 fails to disclose any flat burnishes.

In contrast, the claimed flat burnish provides the advantage of suitable burnishing. This is not obtainable with the device of Buske, which do not have flat, planar edges.

Dependent Claims 5 and 14 require the two burnishes to comprise mutually different materials. The Office Action cites Buske (3:62-4:11) as disclosing burnishes comprising different materials. The cited portion of Buske teaches that "other suitable materials" may be used in forming the body and guide member. However, Buske fails to teach that these materials can be mutually different -- much less be mutually different and disposed on two different burnishes as required by Claims 5 and 14.


Appl. No. 10/700,614  
Atty. Docket No. 9422L  
Amdt. dated June 27, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of 06/07/2005  
Customer No. 27752

In contrast, the claimed arrangement provides the benefit that different materials can be used at different steps in the use of the apparatus. Again, this arrangement is neither taught by nor obvious in view of Buske.

All matters raised by the Office Action are believed to be addressed by the amendments and remarks made hereunder. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and allow all claims remaining in the application.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By   
Signature  
Larry L. Huston  
Typed or Printed Name  
Registration No. 32,994  
(513) 634-9358

June 27, 2005

Customer No. 27752